

REMARKS

In the Office Action of December 14, 2007, the specification was objected to because the abstract contained the terms “said” and “means”. In addition, claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Number 2001/0012018 A1 (“Hayhurst”). Similarly, claims 1 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Number 2003/0179220 A1 (“Dietrich, Jr. et al.”). Furthermore, claims 2-8, 10-12 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable in view of Hayhurst, Dietrich, Jr. et al., U.S. Patent Number 6,567,095 (“Wood”), U.S. Patent Number 6,269,175 (“Hanna et al.”), U.S. Patent Application Number 2001/0036307 A1 (“Hanna et al.”), and/or U.S. Patent Application Number 2003/0145008 A1 (“Burrell”).

With respect to the objection to the specification, Applicants have amended the abstract to remove the terms “said” and “means”. In view of the amendment to the specification, Applicants respectfully request that this objection to the specification be withdrawn.

With respect to the claim rejections, Applicants have amended the independent claims 1 and 9 to more clearly distinguish the claimed invention from the cited reference of Dietrich, Jr. et al. Claims 3-5, 7, 8 and 10-13 have also been amended. As amended, the independent claims 1 and 9 are not anticipated by the cited reference of Dietrich, Jr. et al., as explained below. In view of the claim amendments and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the pending claims 1-14 be allowed.

A. Patentability of Amended Independent Claims 1 and 9

As amended, the independent claim 1 recites in part “*a rasterizer for transversing a surface grid over a surface of primitives of said 3D images for all N*”

different views of said 3D images,” and “N screen space resamplers each for resampling the shaded color sample determined by said shader unit according to one of the N different views,” which are not disclosed in the cited reference of Dietrich, Jr. et al. Thus, the amended independent claim 1 is not anticipated by the cited reference of Dietrich, Jr. et al.

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

The cited reference of Dietrich, Jr. et al. discloses a graphics system (106) that includes a rasterizer (152) and a sample expansion stage (154), as shown in Fig. 1A-1. The rasterizer of Dietrich, Jr. et al. is described in paragraph [0048] as computing “a fragment for each pixel covered by each of the primitives.” There is no mention of different views of any 3D images in the cited reference of Dietrich, Jr. et al. Thus, the cited reference of Dietrich, Jr. et al. does not disclose “*a rasterizer for transversing a surface grid over a surface of primitives of said 3D images for all N different views of said 3D images,*” as recited in the amended independent claim 1.

In addition, the sample expansion stage (154) is described in paragraph [0049] as generating “multiples samples for each fragment.” First, the sample expansion stage (154) is not described as a resampler. Second, since the cited reference of Dietrich, Jr. et al. does not mention different views of any 3D images, the cited reference of Dietrich, Jr. et al. also does not disclose “*N screen space resamplers each for resampling the shaded color sample determined by said shader unit according to one of the N different views,*” as recited in the amended independent claim 1. Thus, the amended independent claim 1 is not anticipated by the cited reference of Dietrich, Jr. et al. As such, Applicants respectfully request that the amended independent claim 1 be allowed.

The above remarks are also applicable to the amended independent claim 9, which recites limitations similar to those of the amended independent claim 1. Thus, the amended independent claim 9 is also not anticipated by the cited reference of

Dietrich, Jr. et al. As such, Applicants respectfully request that the amended independent claim 9 be allowed as well.

B. Patentability of Dependent Claims 2-8 and 10-14

Each of the dependent claims 2-8 and 10-14 depends on one of the amended independent claims 1 and 9. As such, these dependent claims include all the limitations of their respective base claims. Therefore, Applicants submit that these dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims in view of the remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
Barenbrug et al.

Date: March 14, 2008

By: /thomas h. ham/
Thomas H. Ham
Registration No. 43,654
Telephone: (925) 249-1300